REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 11, and 20 have been amended to clarify and better define that which the Applicants consider to be the invention. Claims 1-28 are pending in this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 and 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lambert (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,478)("Lambert") in view of Rubin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,809,140)("Rubin"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants submit that many differences exist between the claimed inventions and the disclosures of Lambert and Rubin but for the sake of brevity, only some will be discussed below. As will be fully explained, Lambert and Rubin individually or in combination do not disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claim 1 as is required to raise a prima facie case of section 103 obviousness. In addition as discussed below, Applicants respectfully traverse the Office's assertions made in paragraph 33 on page 12 of the Final Office Action.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, includes the feature of a server maintaining a state and the state being associated with a session. Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited prior art references disclose this feature. The Office suggests that Lambert discloses a server maintaining a state by citing col. 1, line 67, col. lines 1-7, col. 3, lines 3-8, 62-65. col. 4, lines 3-5, 27-41 of Lambert. Applicants respectfully traverse this suggestion. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Lambert disclose the establishment of a session but do not disclose or suggest the maintaining of a state on the server where the state is associated with a session as claimed in claim 1.

Applicants further respectfully submit that Rubin does not teach the feature of the maintaining of a state on the server where the state is associated with a session. The Office is respectfully directed to column 10, lines 7-10 of Rubin which states as follows:

         Although illustrated above using a single stateless server S, the present invention is also particularly well-suited for use with multiple servers corresponding to multiple replications of the above-described stateless server S.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the Rubin reference teaches that the server used in Rubin's system is stateless.

Furthermore, claim 1 includes the feature of a stateless client. Applicants respectfully submit that Lambert does not disclose or suggest this feature. The Office on page 3, paragraph 5 of the Final Office Action states that "Lambert did not specifically disclose that the client is a stateless client." Therefore, Applicants submit that Lambert does not include the feature of the stateless client.

With respect to the Rubin reference, the Office cites to column 3, lines 20-23, line 67, column 4, lines 1-2, col. 5, lines 49-65, col. 6, lines 6-20, and host 20i of Rubin and suggests that "the client that communicates with the server maybe implemented as stateless client." (Final Office Action, page 3, paragraph 5). Applicants respectfully traverse this suggestion. Applicants respectfully submit that the portions of Rubin cited by the Office disclose usage of a stateless "smart card" that can be applied to a card interface of the host. In contrast, in claim 1, the at least one client is coupled to at least one server. In addition, the specification of the present application makes a distinction between a smart card and a stateless client (see e.g., specification Page 10, lines 19-20).

In response to Applicants' arguments in the Amendment of July 22, 2004, the Office has suggested that the hosts of Rubin are stateless and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at to combine Lambert and Rubin because Rubin's teachings of using a stateless computer as a client computer in initiating session with the server enables devices with limited processing capabilities and memory to establish sessions with the server in Lambert's system. Applicants respectfully traverse these suggestions. The Office seems to

suggest that because the smart card is stateless, the host must also be stateless. Applicants respectfully submit that this suggestion is not supported by the cited portions of Rubin. Again, as discussed above, Applicants respectfully submits that the cited portions of Rubin do not disclose or suggest that the host itself is stateless. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Rubin does not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention of claim 1 as is required to raise a prima facie case of obviousness.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that Lambert and Rubin, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed inventions as is required to put forth a prima facie case of obviousness. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

Claims 4-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert and Rubin as applied to claims 1-3 and 8-9 and further in view of Zhao (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,404). Claims 11-14, 16-18, 20-23 and 25-27 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert et al. in view of Zhao, and Rubin. These rejections are respectfully traversed. The discussion regarding claim 1 with respect to the deficiencies of Lambert and Rubin are also applicable with respect to the claims 4-5, 7, 11-14, 16-18, 20-23 and 25-27. In addition, Zhao does not disclose or suggest the feature of a stateless client nor does Zhao disclose or suggest maintaining a state on a server where the state is associated with a session. In addition, with respect to claims 11 and 20, the claimed inventions include the feature of providing data associated with said session to said user at a first stateless client computer. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Rubin only discuss usage of a smart card but does not disclose or suggest providing data associated with said session to said user at the first stateless computer. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the smart cards are not stateless client computers as used and defined

by the present application. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that this feature is not disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art references.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Lambert, Rubin, Zhao, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claims as is required to make a prima facie case of obviousness. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4-5, 7, 11-14, 16-18, 20-23 and 25-27 are allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 15 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, Zhao, and Rubin as applied to claims 11-12 and 20 and further in view of "Official Notice." Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Applicants respectfully disagrees with the Office's "Official Notice" because the cited prior art references do not indicate that it would have been obvious for a session on a server to comprise a plurality of processes on behalf of the user to allow the user to obtain the desired data from the server. Applicants respectfully request that the Office provide a citation to a reference that supports the above assertion made by the Office.

Claims 19 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, Zhao, and Rubin as applied to claims 11-12, 18 and 20 and further in view of Hamdi (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,124). Claims 6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert and Rubin as applied to claims 1-3 and 8-9 and further in view of Hamdi. These rejections are respectfully traversed. The discussion regarding Lambert, Rubin, and Zhao above are also applicable here. In addition, Hamdi does not disclose or suggest the feature of a stateless client and the cited portions of Hamdi do not disclose or suggest maintaining a state in a server where the state is associated with the session. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Lambert, Rubin, Zhao, and/or Hamdi individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claimed inventions are allowable

over the cited prior art. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the section 103

rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that these claims are in condition for

allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a

telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may

reach the undersigned at **(408) 774-6927**. If any additional fees are due in connection with

the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit

Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP070).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

Edmund H. Mizumoto
Reg. No. 46,938

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
(408) 774-6927
Customer Number 32291